

senseless violence. Ending the American epidemic of gun violence will require more than a change in law.

It is clear we need a change in our culture; but oftentimes, changing our culture starts with changing our laws. By enacting reasonable reforms, we can make a difference. We can make it more difficult for would-be assassins to access guns. We can ensure every gun in America is purchased after a background check rather than only 60 percent of guns, as is currently the case.

We can crack down on the flow of illegal guns onto our streets by improving gun trafficking data, and we can reduce the fatality rate by banning assault rifles and high-capacity magazines that are designed exclusively for killing dozens of people at once.

Let's face it, when you have an assault rifle with a high-capacity magazine, you are not hunting deer; you are hunting people. The gun lobby tries to argue that any attempt to regulate gun access is an attempt to restrict all gun access, but there is such a thing as commonsense, middle-ground gun reform, and most gun owners support it.

Can we stop every shooting? No. But can we reduce their frequency and deadliness? Absolutely—the first step toward keeping dangerous guns out of the hands of dangerous people is to begin the conversation. Let's break the silence, stop the violence, and start the conversation.

NO DEAL IS BETTER THAN A BAD DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration and Tehran are yet again running up against another deadline. This one comes next Tuesday when the clock expires on reaching a comprehensive nuclear deal.

Mr. Speaker, if you head over to whitehouse.gov, there is a site outlining the current nuclear negotiations. On the front page of this Web site, when discussing what a possible deal with Iran should do, it states: "prevent Iran from using the cover of negotiations to continue advancing its nuclear program as we seek to negotiate a long-term comprehensive solution that addresses all of the international community's concerns."

Mr. Speaker, what have we seen in reality? It is a possible deal that could block international inspectors from having unrestricted access to all of Iran's nuclear sites to verify their compliance. Mr. Speaker, what could Iran possibly have to hide if their nuclear work is solely for peaceful purposes?

We have also seen a deal that doesn't require Iran to disclose all of its previous nuclear work and possible military dimensions. It is a bad deal because, if Iran expects the world to trust them and lift sanctions, why not come clean?

I also see a deal that could lift all sanctions once the ink is dried, which is a bad deal, because what would this instant relief be rewarding? Years of covert work, violations of U.N. resolutions, and the export of terror across the globe—no one in good faith could say that the deal before the world right now prevents Iran from obtaining a pathway to the bomb. If anything, Mr. Speaker, it puts them on a pathway to the bomb.

It has been clear for some time now that this administration has been negotiating not with Iran, but with itself. We have seen them consistently move the goalpost on what they are willing to accept with respect to essential components of a good deal. This ranges from the number of centrifuges to inspections to the dismantling of nuclear infrastructure.

The parameters of what this administration is willing to accept has moved so many times, I don't believe it would surprise anyone if reports emerged before next Tuesday that showed even more concessions have been made.

Mr. Speaker, the administration needs to prevent Iran from having a pathway to the bomb. They need to hold good on their word that no deal is better than a bad deal.

Mr. Speaker, I don't see how anyone right now, with the exception of Iran, could accept the reported deal as a "good deal." Let's not settle for a bad deal; let's not stand for a nuclear Iran.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stress the importance of reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank's charter, which has served this Nation well. The Export-Import Bank is an important program used to support our Nation's entrepreneurs—the best in the world—and keep them competitive in today's global economy.

It is a tool. It is a tool that has enjoyed bipartisan support over the years, just like trade agreements are a tool to, in fact, increase jobs here in America, good-paying jobs.

The Bank provides trade financing to solutions to boost U.S. job growth, and it has been successful in increasing exports for American goods and services—American goods that are made here—at no cost—no cost—to the American taxpayer.

This program is set to expire, sadly, tomorrow—tomorrow. Unfortunately, the House Republican leadership is refusing to bring it to the floor for a vote, with thousands of American jobs at risk.

Now, if the Bank charter expires, American workers and American businesses that are trying to sell their products and goods overseas face a completely unnecessary blow to their ability to compete.

In total, the Ex-Im Bank—otherwise known, abbreviated—has created and sustained over 1.5 million jobs in the private sector since 2007 alone—1.5 million jobs since 2007. Last year alone, the Bank sustained over 164,000 export-related American good-paying jobs.

If you want to build it in America, you have got to ensure that American workers and businesses can compete. The Ex-Im Bank represents a vital pillar, therefore, in our ability to be competitive overseas, and it has had significant impacts in the San Joaquin Valley that I represent.

Why? Well, many of the businesses that I talk to that use the Ex-Im Bank tell me: JIM, we have the ability to compete. We make our products better, but when we are sitting at the table with foreign competitors, many of these countries want to know, do you have a financing plan in place?

It is because, contingent upon their ability to choose us or choose our competitors, many of these countries want to know that this can be financially put together in a fashion so that the deal works for everybody, and that is what the Bank does.

In my district alone, the Ex-Im Bank has afforded a number of small business exporters—some of which are minority and women owned—to have exports in places all over the world, places like India, Mexico, Turkey, Hong Kong; and I could go on. These businesses export \$77 million worth of goods, ranging from machinery to manufacturing to crop production of the variety and diversity of agricultural exports that we do in California.

As a matter of fact, in California, the Ex-Im Bank has resulted in increased exports of over \$27 billion. Now, let's put this in perspective. Last year, California exported \$174 billion in products.

The Ex-Im Bank was responsible for helping to finance \$27 billion of that \$174 billion. As a matter of fact, \$19.4 billion of the \$174 billion that was exported last year from California were agricultural products grown in the San Joaquin Valley.

The Bank helps level the playing field, therefore, for American workers and American businesses, allowing them to compete and succeed in the global economy that we live in today. That is just the facts.

In these trying times, the last thing Congress should be doing is jeopardizing the economic health of our Nation by refusing to provide Americans with the tools—the tools, which is what this Bank is—they need to compete effectively in the global marketplace.

It is important to note that there is a vast bipartisan support for renewing the Bank's charter. Let me be clear. Despite attempts to paint this as a partisan issue, I do not believe it is. Sadly, though, there are some of my colleagues on the other side who have decided to play partisan politics with the Bank. That, then, therefore threatens American jobs, halting economic

growth and undermining American businesses' ability of all sizes to compete in this global market.

Now is the time for long-term reauthorization of the Bank so that American entrepreneurs can use this tool to create more jobs in our country. This can only happen with bipartisan support. I stand and ask my colleagues to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank on behalf of American workers and American businesses.

NUCLEAR DEAL WITH IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the single greatest threat to the national security of the United States is Iran's drive for nuclear weapons. The result of the negotiations being conducted by President Obama and our Western allies will shape the long-term security and stability of the United States for years to come.

Iran is the world's leading sponsor of terror, a stronghold for terrorists whose very mission is to spread oppression. Iranian leaders have called for the complete annihilation of Israel, calling Israel a "barbaric, wolflike, and infanticidal regime." Iranian leaders have said that the United States of America has "no place among the nations."

By its own declaration, Iran is not looking for a peaceful path of coexistence. There can be nothing more dangerous for America or our allies than a nuclear-armed Iran. That is why a bad deal with Iran, one that leaves the door open for Iranian nuclear weapons, must be avoided at all costs.

In order to alleviate these concerns, the President and his national security team have said over and over that a bad deal is worse than no deal at all; but will that sentiment actually stop this administration from entering into a bad deal with Iran? What I have seen so far, through the framework agreement released in April, raises serious concerns.

Under this framework agreement, not a single Iranian nuclear centrifuge will be dismantled. No nuclear facilities will be shut down. While some of Iran's nuclear infrastructure will be temporarily warehoused, most of Iran's nuclear infrastructure will remain completely intact. All of these factors point to a flawed understanding of a "good deal" by President Obama; yet this is the deal we may well be given.

Twenty years ago, the United States was negotiating with another country on nuclear weapons development. During these talks with the Soviet Union and Gorbachev in the 1980s, President Ronald Reagan used the proverb "trust, but verify" throughout those discussions.

I do not see this administration using that same tactic. In fact, it seems to me that in regards to Iran, the Obama

administration is operating on the principle of "trust and don't verify."

As things stand, these ongoing nuclear negotiations are placing far too much faith in a country that has proven itself both deceptive and unpredictable.

Mr. President, a good deal must contain the following five points: first, a deal that requires anytime, anywhere inspections; second, a deal that would only lift sanctions when Iran demonstrates compliance with its obligations; third, a deal must require Iran to provide a complete report of its past nuclear activities; fourth, a deal must require Iran to dismantle its nuclear weapons infrastructure; and, last but not least, a good deal must not allow Iran to become a nuclear state ever.

Without these conditions in place, the United States will, without a doubt, be prioritizing a bad deal over no deal at all.

□ 1030

HONORING DICK HORIGAN ON HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a very dear friend, Dick Horigan.

Richard hails from my hometown of Amsterdam, New York. Dick turns 90 on Friday, and it is worth noting this milestone because he has epitomized the generosity, humility, and dedication of the World War II generation, and he has made Amsterdam a better place as a result.

Richard T. Horigan wasn't born in Amsterdam, nor did he grow up there. In horse racing terms, a sport he continues to enjoy at the nearby historic Saratoga Race Course, Dick was a "shipper" from Scranton, Pennsylvania.

After serving in the Navy in the Pacific during World War II, he enrolled in Georgetown University. On a blind date, he met Marie Smeallie, the beautiful daughter of Donald and Agnes Smeallie of Amsterdam, and they were married shortly thereafter. Upon Dick's graduation from Georgetown law school, Marie convinced him to move to Amsterdam and begin his law practice there.

Since 1951, Dick has been a pillar of our community. Retired now, he was very active in the American Bar Association and the American College of Trial Lawyers. Dick was the consummate attorney and a leader in his field. He was the village attorney for nearby Hagaman, and practiced before the United States District Court, the Northern District of New York, and the United States Court of Appeals.

In the 1970s, he struck out on his own, and his son, Tim, joined him to start Horigan & Horigan, which continues to be one of the top firms not only in Amsterdam, but throughout New York's greater capital region.

While his love of his profession is strong, his love of family is even stronger. When Marie passed away in 1977, he found himself spending more and more time with Ellie Smeallie, who had been widowed many years earlier. In 1979, Ellie and Dick were married. This good-looking couple merged two great families and brought them even closer together.

Dick is the patriarch of 13 children, 33 grandchildren, and, yes, 3 great-grandchildren. While many of them live outside of the region now, they all come back to visit, especially in August, when the historic Saratoga Race Course is open.

In addition to horse racing, his other passions include golfing and helping St. Mary's Catholic Church, where I would often see him at mass in the mornings.

We wish a happy 90th birthday to Richard Horigan. I hope there are many more to come, Dick. You are a beloved, reliable patriarch of an awesome clan. You are a respected, loyal friend to countless many, including myself.

My message here on the House floor is: To a great man, have a great day. It is my honor to recognize your 90th birthday.

ENDLESS WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the week before last, the greatly respected conservative columnist Thomas Sowell wrote:

What lessons might we learn from the whole experience of the Iraq war? If nothing else, we should never again imagine that we can engage in nation building in the sweeping sense that term acquired in Iraq—least of all, building a democratic Arab nation in a region of the world that has never had such a thing in a history that goes back thousands of years.

The week before last, the longtime conservative leader David Keene wrote in the Washington Times about our Middle East wars:

The concept of U.S. national interests was stretched beyond any rational meaning with the argument that "democracies don't go to war with democracies," so rebuilding the world in our own image was seen as our ultimate national interest.

Mr. Keene went on and said:

America took on more than we could possibly handle. The result is a generation of young Americans who have never known peace, a decade in which thousands of our best have died or been maimed with little to show for their sacrifices, our enemies have multiplied, and the national debt has skyrocketed.

The week before last, the publisher of The American Conservative magazine, Jon Utley, wrote an article entitled: "12 Reasons America Doesn't Win Its Wars." The Magazine said:

Too many parties now benefit from perpetual warmongering for the U.S. to ever conclude its military conflicts.